

4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### MacArthur Park Branch Library 2019

Overall Rating

4

#### *Ratings Summary*

<i>BOND ACT CRITERIA</i>	<i>RATING</i>	
Urban and Rural		See Map
Population Growth		57%
Age and Condition	4	
Needs of residents/response of proposed project to needs	3	
Plan of service integrates appropriate technology	4	
Appropriateness of site	4	
Financial capacity (new libraries only)		yes

#### *Non-Evaluative Comments*

None.

#### *Project Summary*

<i>Applicant:</i>	Long Beach, City of
<i>Library Jurisdiction:</i>	Long Beach Public Library
<i>Project Type/Priority:</i>	New Library/1
<i>Project Square Footage:</i>	16,155
<i>State Grant Request:</i>	\$6,366,733

# EVALUATION FORM

## MacArthur Park Branch Library 2019

### Age and Condition of Existing Library

Regulatory Basis: 20440, Appendices 1 & 3

#### Age Rating

- 4 = No Existing Facility
- 4 = 1949 or older
- 3 = 1950-1959
- 2 = 1960-1964
- 1 = 1965-1974
- 0 = 1975-2003

RATING

4

3

4

#### Structural Renovation Rating

- 4 = No Renovation
- 4 = 1954 & earlier
- 3 = 1955-1962
- 2 = 1963-1972
- 1 = 1973-1978
- 0 = 1979-2003

- 4 = Extremely Poor Condition
- 3 = Poor condition
- 2 = Acceptable condition
- 1 = Good condition
- 0 = Very good condition

#### Condition of Existing Library

1. Structural
2. Lighting
3. Energy
4. Health & Safety
5. ADA
6. Acoustical
7. Flexibility
8. Spatial Relationships
9. Site Considerations

R1	R2	R3
3	4	4
3	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4

### Rating panel comments

Library construction date: 1958

Library renovation date: none

R1:

Major deficiencies of the existing library include: inadequate space to provide public library services to the current user area residents; inefficient energy conservation, due in part to single-paned windows; no public restroom, requiring library clientele to exit the building and cross a park (high crime area); and sound transfer from one area to another, creating disruptions.

# EVALUATION FORM

## MacArthur Park Branch Library 2019

R2:

Already undersized at completion in 1958, this 2130 square foot facility is now grossly inadequate to meet current need for collection development and demand for reader sitting area, computer terminals, training activities and staff work areas. Cinder block wall construction with single-pane window mitigate any effective energy management program. There are no public restrooms necessitating that patrons of all ages be channeled to restrooms in a nearby park in this high crime area. No dedicated parking exists for the library. Accoustics are miserable due to its wide open design and cinder block walls, which tend to reverberate sound. The Park and Recreation Department that co-habiitates the building desires to annex the library's space for its own expansion.

R3:

This 1958, 45-year-old building has lived past its time as an adequate facility for the community. The 2,130 sq. ft. cinderblock building meets virtually no building standards. The poor interior lighting pales beside the security risk of poor exterior lighting because the building has no public restrooms. Children and adults must leave the building and cross a large area of the park to use a graffiti-filled open park restroom. The facility needs to serve about 60,000 people including many new immigrants, but there simply is not enough space to collect materials to serve the newest citizens. There are no more areas in the building to convert to library space; the 100 sq. ft. staff break room is now the computer and homework center with four computers. There are no private areas for the staff; all work is done in the open area shared with the patrons. The city is planning to locate the new facility in this same neighborhood, although it has crime and gang problems because the city wants to serve the new immigrant citizens of this area, and many can't leave to go to other neighborhoods to get library services.

4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## MacArthur Park Branch Library 2019

### ***Needs and Response to Needs***

Regulatory Basis: 20440 pp. 26, 27, 60-69

**RATING**

**3**

#### **Community Library Needs Assessment**

1. Methodology & community involvement.
2. Community analysis/community agencies & organizations, service area demographics
3. Analysis of service needs/consistency with demographics
4. Service limitations for existing facility (if applicable)
5. Space needs assessment
6. Executive summary includes description of K-12 student population and their needs

R1	R2	R3
4	3	4
3	2	2
4	3	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	3	4

#### **Library Plan of Service**

7. How well project responds to needs of residents
8. How well project responds to needs of K-12 students as expressed in Needs Assessment
9. How well mission, roles, goals, objectives, service indicators are documented
10. How well types of services are documented
11. How well types of K-12 services are documented
12. How project fits into jurisdiction-wide Plan of Service

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	3	4
4	3	4
4	4	4

#### **Library Building Program**

13. How well Building Program implements Plan of Service.
14. How well Building Program documents general requirements for Library Building.
15. How well spatial relationships are described.
16. How well individual spaces are sized and described.

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
3	3	3
3	3	3
2	2	2

#### **Conceptual Plans**

17. How well net-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
18. How well non-assignable SF on plan matches Building Program
19. How well spatial relationships on plan match Building Program

R1	R2	R3
3	3	3
4	3	3
4	4	3

#### **Joint Use Cooperative Agreement**

20. How well roles & responsibilities are defined.
21. How clearly joint library services are described.
22. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of hours of service.
23. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of staffing/volunteers.
24. How well ownership issues are resolved
25. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of sources & uses of funding
26. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of review & modification process
27. How well agreement demonstrates a workable, mutually beneficial long-term partnership.

R1	R2	R3
4	3	3
4	3	3
4	3	3
3	3	3
2	3	3
3	3	3
2	2	2
3	3	3

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### MacArthur Park Branch Library 2019

#### Rating Panel Comments

R1:

**Needs Assessment:**

An excellent needs assessment that included a broad variety of input methods that resulted in very high community involvement in the needs assessment process. Analysis of the information and demographics led to appropriate library service conclusions. An excellent space needs assessment analysis with a comprehensive breakdown of collections and shelving requirements.

**Plan of Service:**

The planned services are derived directly from the needs assessment findings, with excellent goals and objectives that are clear and should be easily implemented. Overall, very well-written plan.

**Joint Use Agreement:**

The agreement is clearly written, and describes the services very well. While actual funding will be coming primarily from the library, the school district will be cooperating in developing the services and in providing staff for the joint services. Ownership of library materials, equipment, etc., is not addressed -- only the ownership of the facility itself. There will be a committee comprised of a broad representation of both parties and others, and it will meet four times during the initial 12 months of the agreement for planning purposes. However, it will meet only every 2 years subsequent to implementation of the services, which will not enable timely review, evaluation, and modification of the services.

**Building Program:**

The general requirements appear to be very well done, but could have provided more detailed information in some cases. The spatial relationships diagram and narrative is very good in showing the critical relationships, but a more detailed description of secondary relationships in the narrative would be helpful. The individual space descriptions are sparse and need more detail. While there appears to be adequate functional description of what goes on in each space as well as the spatial relationships, occupancy requirements and a list of the furniture and equipment for each space, other requirements such as those for lighting, power and data, HVAC, etc., that are specific to the space are not present.

**Conceptual Plans:**

It appears that the building program and conceptual plans match very well in terms of net-assignable square footage. There are only a couple of exceptions where the plan required considerably more space than what was called for in the building program (Adult & Teen Computers and Staff Work Area, Supplies & Equipment Storage areas). The building program calls for 20% non-assignable square footage and the plans deliver 20% non-assignable which is optimal.

The conceptual plans appear to meet most all of the critical spatial relationships called for in the building program, although there are a few places where line of sight requirements have not been met satisfactorily. Overall an excellent response to the program by the architect.

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### MacArthur Park Branch Library 2019

#### **R2:**

##### **Needs Assessment:**

Methods were varied and responsive to the particular community. List of community organizations includes a variety of appropriate ones but totalled only 7 - a low number of this community. Analysis of service needs is consistent with needs defined and the demographics. Only problem is that this moves beyond stating the service need to actually define the service response, a function of the Plan of Service rather than the Needs Assessment. Is very repetitive of Plan's discussions. Existing facility is clearly inadequate. Extremely well done space needs assessment, with nothing crucial omitted and solid rationales provided for each recommendation.

##### **Plan of Service:**

Response to the stated needs is excellent. This is an extremely clear plan -- easy to evaluate. It should provide an excellent future guide for staff and the community. Service indicators are good but would be better to see some that are outcomes measures-based. This is a model of a Plan of Service: responsive to the needs, very clearly written, and has the potential to be a real guide for the library staff.

##### **Joint Use Agreement:**

This is a true, joint, mutually-beneficial and mutually-contributed to venture. The District provides teacher and paraprofessional staff to work in the Center as well as educational software for the literacy program. While the library is providing more than the District, both are providing significantly.

##### **Building Program:**

The general requirements of the Building Program are high quality. The description of the spatial relationships is very effective with a category called "sight lines" that lists spaces that need to be have visual supervision. Also, there is a very good bubble diagram that assists in communicating to the architect the relationships needed. The individual space descriptions and sizing are adequate. However, there is no detailed description of very important elements in many of the spaces; description of access, finishes, lighting, power and data, acoustics, signage, security, HVAC, the furniture and equipment, etc., is minimal. Where there is description of lighting, or power and data, it isn't specific enough; for example, description of the quantity and location of the quad receptacles is too vague.

##### **Conceptual Plans:**

The net-assignable square footage on the plan matches the Building Program very effectively. There are a couple of areas that the plan SF is substantially lower, however, than the square footage required by the Building Program. The open layout of the plan effectively provides circulation flow through the spaces without using corridors, which allows for future flexibility. The non-assignable square footage listing is confusing. It would be clearer and more useful if the non-assignable spaces had been grouped together as non-assignable square footage instead of listing each space separately (e.g., Electrical Room, Telecom. Room, etc.). The spatial relationships shown in the plan match the Building Program very closely. Again, this contributes to the circulation flow effectively obtained in this layout.

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### MacArthur Park Branch Library 2019

R3:

#### **Needs Assessment:**

This library received a grant from the State Library in 1989 for the Partnerships for Change Program, which taught libraries how to be more responsive to the needs of their local communities. It is gratifying to see that the community linkages and partnerships established in 1989 have grown and that the input from the community has broadened. An excellent methodology has emerged in an excellent needs assessment. Community surveys were available in three languages -- Khmer, Spanish and English. (It is apparent that the library is very much aware of the needs of the local community.) There is no public restroom in the existing facility, and children, particularly in the evening hours, often need to be escorted to restrooms in the park. Library service needs are not included for community organizations.

#### **Plan of Service:**

Demographics and service thrusts are complementary and respond directly to findings in the needs assessment. There is a direct correlation between demographics and service goals. Youth (ages 19 and under) comprise 44.3% of the population, so services for youth are a priority.

#### **Joint Use Agreement:**

The proposed partnership is viable, with both parties assuming responsibilities, services, and funding.

#### **Building Program**

The 16,000 gross square footage building for a 63,000 population seems a bit small. The needs assessment describes nature of the community as being one that "can be intimidated by large, official buildings." However, an architect should be able to create an accessible scale, both exterior and interior, while providing a building of a more adequate size for that population. Use of study centers, alcoves, etc., can add assignable square footage and seating while responding to local sensibilities as a community commons. It leaves the impression that the building was tailored to fit the site. Specific requirements are adequate, but could provide more detail and thought in response to the specifics of this community. The adjacency diagram is confusing.

#### **Conceptual Plans:**

The plan does not provide assignable square footage for spaces, only gross sq. ft, making evaluation difficult. In general, it appears to be fairly close. However, several exceptions (assignable square footage from the building program, gross square footage from drawings; the latter should be larger than the former): adult circulating books; childrens circulating collection; staff room; family space/parents.

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### MacArthur Park Branch Library 2019

#### ***Integration of Electronic Technologies***

**RATING**

**4**

Regulatory Basis: p.68, 20440, Appendix 4

#### **Integration of Electronic Technologies**

1. Appropriateness of electronic technologies in Plan of Service, based on Needs Assessment
2. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in Plan of Service
3. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in the Building Program

R1	R2	R3
4	3	4
4	3	4
4	3	3

#### **Rating Panel Comments**

R1:

Comprehensive -- technology throughout planning documents -- ease of use for end user in mind -- distance learning -- e-mail access -- ESL software -- computer access in all study and meeting spaces -- wireless access planned -- information literacy for students -- multi-lingual OPAC interfaces -- single-search capability for multiple databases

R2:

Very well done technology plan - appropriate and detailed treatment with vision for the future. The manager of Automated Services was involved in the development of this plan, so it seems effective and realistic. That inclusion should also help to keep the branch's needs on the IT department's radar screen.

R3:

The proposed technologies respond directly to needs identified by the community in the needs assessment as well as to the jurisdictional strategic plan. Propose to increase the number of online public access computers to 43 in an attempt to address the digital divide which is found in lower socio-economic populations. Multi-lingual interfaces including Spanish are planned as well as the possibility of developing Khmer language interfaces for the online catalog which is very much in keeping with the demographics of the community.



4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## MacArthur Park Branch Library 2019

### Site

Regulatory Basis: p.39, 20440, Appendix 1

RATING

4

#### Appropriateness of Site

1. Equal access for all residents in service area.
2. Accessibility via public transit.
3. Accessibility via pedestrian and bicycle.
4. Accessibility via automobile.
5. Adequacy of automobile parking.
6. Adequacy of bicycle parking.
7. Overall parking rationale.
8. Shared parking agreement (if applicable).
9. Visibility of site & proposed library building in service area
10. How well site fits community context & planning
11. Site selection process and summary.

R1	R2	R3
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	4	4
4	3	4
3	4	3
4	4	3
4	4	4

N/A

4	4	4
3	4	4
3	3	3

#### Site Description

12. Adequacy of size of site.
13. Appropriateness of site configuration
14. Appropriateness of site/surrounding area.
15. Appropriateness of site based on placement of building, parking, access roads, pathways, expansion and parking.

R1	R2	R3
2	2	2
4	4	4
4	4	4
3	2	3

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### MacArthur Park Branch Library 2019

#### Rating Panel Comments

**Drainage issues:** OK

**Geotechnical issues:** There are no known active faults extending through the site. The site is suitable for use for a public library .

R1:

The proposed library site is centrally located in the heart of the service area, and just 100 feet from where the existing library was located for 45 years. The site is centrally located both geographically and in terms of population.

The site is on Anaheim Street a major east/west arterial thoroughfare (33,000 vehicles / day) and is located between Cherry Ave (16,000 vehicles / day - 5 blocks east of site) and Atlantic Ave (17,000 vehicles / day - 9 blocks west of the site), both of which are major north/south arterial thoroughfares. Four blocks to the south of the site, 7th street has 33,000 vehicles / day as well.

The site is located in a highly urbanized area of Long Beach, near mini-malls and family-owned and operated businesses offering a variety of services to the community. Land use is mixed commercial all along Anaheim St. both east and west of the proposed site except for MacArthur park next door to the site. The proposed library site is six blocks from Anaheim Plaza as well.

There are 10 bus stops within 1/4 mile of the site and the Long Beach transit headquarters is located .3 miles east of the site. 3 blocks south of the site there are bus stops that connect with the City's largest downtown transit mall which serves as a hub for the greater LA Metro area. There is a door-to-door bus system for the disabled and elderly as well.

The site is about 1 1/2 blocks from an elementary school and within walking distance to 4 other schools (3 elementary and 1 high school) within the library service area. The streets around the site have sidewalks and there will be 13 bicycle parking spaces near the front entrance that appear to be sheltered. The have also developed a "yellow brick road" concept to safely bring pedestrians and bicyclists to the front door of the building.

There are 60 on-site parking spaces dedicated to library users and another 125 on-street spaces within 500' of the front door.

The site is located in the City's Central Redevelopment area and the library is seen as a catalyst to revitalize the area.

The site was selected after extensive interviews and surveys during the needs assessment process. There were numerous meetings with stakeholders and interest groups as well as public officials providing for broad representation from the community. The site has overwhelming community consensus.

There does not appear to be any room to expand either the building or parking in the future.

4 = Outstanding  
3 = Very Good  
2 = Acceptable  
1 = Limitations  
0 = Serious Limitations

## EVALUATION FORM

### MacArthur Park Branch Library 2019

#### R2:

The site is equally accessible in its small catchment area. Two bus lines are directly in front (several stops), several others three blocks away. There is paratransit as well. Bicycle path access is a mile away.

There are 13 unsheltered bicycle slots to be provided; sight from circulation desk is partially obscured. The nearest signal across busy Anaheim is two blocks away at Walnut. Autos exiting onto Gundry that want to go east on Anaheim will either have to circle around a couple of blocks to Walnut if they want a signaled intersection or cross traffic at Gundy and Anaheim.

The on-site dedicated auto parking of 60 spaces, plus several street spaces, provides more than adequate parking.

Keeping the new library at the existing, well-known site on a major thoroughfare is a plus. The electronic sign on the wall is also a plus for visibility. It is not indicated if alternate sites were considered; however, the participation of the public in validating the site is excellent, as is the choice of the site itself. The library building footprint is more than 1/3 the site, limiting adding either square footage of future addition or parking. The near-square building footprint eases layout.

#### R3:

Proposed site is just 100' east of current MacArthur Park branch on Anaheim, a major east/west arterial, and is central to the densely populated, diverse neighborhood it is designed to serve. The site is across from the park and bounded by both residential and retail areas. Public transit is excellent with 10 stops within a 1/4 mile providing access all neighborhood and municipal lines and connections to regional transit. Pedestrian and bicycle access is excellent from all directions. Automobile access is well thought out -- single curb cut from the less traveled Gundry and with provision for pedestrians to enter the library from both directions without crossing the parking corridor. Automobile parking is very good with 60 on site/off street spaces and an additional 125 available off site/on street. Bicycle parking is ample (13 spaces) though none appear to be sheltered. Heavy pedestrian and public transit use of this neighborhood facility can be anticipated. Both the location and design of the library should render it highly visible in the community. The proposed project is a key component in the community's plans to revitalize and redevelop this urban mixed use neighborhood. While the site is of adequate size to accommodate the planned facility, any future expansion on this site will be difficult.

EVALUATION FORM  
**MacArthur Park Branch Library 2019**

***Financial Capacity***

Regulatory Basis: Bond Act p. 5, Section 19998 (a) (7)

**Rating Panel Comments:**

Applicant has committed to the on-going operation of the completed library.